



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Rejoinders.

I AM disappointed to find that my friend, Dr. Steinschneider, refuses to accept my dating and placing of Berachyah Nakdan and his identity with Benedict le puncteur, of Oxford, in his magnificent *Opus maximum, Die Hebraischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, § 573, pp. 959-62. I was very proud of that piece of identification, by which I, a rank outsider in mediæval Jewish literature, was enabled, as I thought, to solve an important question in dispute between the two leaders of research in that department of study, Dr. Steinschneider and Dr. Neubauer. It is not often, indeed, that one has a chance of being a prophet in literary research. A theoretical chemist may be able to prophesy as to the results of combining certain elements, and may see his foresight confirmed in the laboratory. But the literary researcher has rarely such opportunities, and I had congratulated myself on having had the good luck to find a conjecture confirmed by an after-discovery. On general grounds of the history of the Æsopic Fable and of the English Jews, I was led to conjecture that Berachyah Nakdan—who in the view of Jewish scholars was a Provençal Jew of c. 1265—lived in England c. 1194, and was to be identified with Benedictus le puncteur (not “punctor,” as Steinschneider prints it, page 960), an Oxford Jew, who in that year contributed to a donum to Richard I. after his return from captivity. Shortly after this, Dr. Neubauer discovers that in his rhymed preface (which did not appear in the edition made use of by me), Berachyah Nakdan actually mentions that he was writing in “the land of the Isle” (England) during times of persecution, which would well suit the period of the *émeutes* 1189-90. I should have thought this was conclusive, but Dr. Steinschneider considers the birthplace “unsicher, England nicht genügend erwiesen.” I venture to think, on the contrary, that his doubt is “nicht genügend erwiesen,” for all the argument he brings forward is that the reading of the MS., נב (rather ED. PR.) is incorrect, though it occurs in two separate places of the introduction. From a passage in the “General Remarks” to the book (page xix.), I gather that Dr. Steinschneider has more lately come to look more leniently on an English domicile for Berachyah, but is deterred by the general improbability of any original culture in England. Perhaps my recently issued *Jews of Angevin England* will render this ground less tenable. It must, however, be remembered that the English Jews of the twelfth century were spiritually and even linguistically French Jews. But that is true of the ordinary English writers of the time; they wrote French, and London, as the centre of the Angevin empire, was in the latter half of the twelfth century

the centre of *French* culture. There is, therefore, no *à priori* improbability of its being the centre of Judæo-French culture.

With regard to Berachyah's date Dr. Steinschneider appears to be more convinced of the truth of my "kübhne Hypothese," though even here he seems only convinced against his will. He places him now at the beginning of the thirteenth century, *i.e.* some half a century earlier than the *floruit* 1250-70, which he gave in *Heb. Bibl.* xiii. 83. Why he cannot accept the reference in the Introduction to "the turning of the wheel of Fate in the land of the Isle (England)," as relating to the massacres of 1189-90, I fail to see. The Berlin colophon of Berachyah's son Elia, dated "Wednesday, 21st Marcheshvan 94 of the 4th thousand" I have proved ("Athen.," 19th April, 1890) can only apply to the year 1233, because in that year 21st Marcheshvan did fall on a Wednesday, which was not the case for the year 1333, to which the colophon had previously been thought to apply. If Elia, the son of Berachyah's old age, was writing in 1233, there is nothing to object to Berachyah himself writing about 1190. Dr. Steinschneider grants there is something in my point that Berachyah is quoted by Moses ben Isaac, the author of the *ס' הש"ה*, who knows only Joseph Kimchi, and not his greater son David, who wrote at the beginning of the thirteenth century. He himself has pointed out that Berachyah, in his ethical work *Matzref*, quotes Abraham ben David, ob. 1198 without the usual formula for the dead, so that one work of Berachyah at least was written before the beginning of the thirteenth century.

It is probable, though "nicht genügend erwiesen," that Berachyah wrote in England; it is practically certain that he wrote before 1198. If then we find a "Benedictus le puncteur" in Oxford in 1194, it does not seem to be a very rash proceeding to identify him with Berachyah ha-Naqdan or the Punctuator. It is scarcely possible to suggest any meaning for "*le puncteur*" except as a translation of הנקדן. Yet Dr. Steinschneider finds this identification "nichts weniger als bewiesen." It is difficult to see what further proof could be given. It is scarcely likely that Berachyah when paying in his 26s. 8d. would have said to the Exchequer clerk, "kindly enter me as the author of the *Fox Fables*," or in giving his name in his book would have added המכונה ל' פונקטור, as "le puncteur," is simply the translation of הנקדן, and when the secular name (*Kinnui*) is merely a translation, it is never given as an alias (המכונה). Altogether it strikes me as unreasonable to demand stronger proof of the identity of Berachyah with Benedict of Oxford than the general coincidence of name, place, and date. Dr. Steinschneider,

in the possession of vast flocks of conjecture with which he has enriched the bibliography of Jewish literature, need not grudge me one little ewe lamb.

Dr. Steinschneider is equally sceptical about my identification of Samuel Nakdan, with Samuel le pointeur, of Bristol. Here I have only gone on general resemblances, and only desired to raise the question which can alone be settled by a careful examination of the Berlin MS. of Samuel's ס"ק. I had hoped that Dr. Steinschneider himself, who is on the spot, would have devoted an hour or so to settling the question, which is one of the very greatest interest for the early history of English Jews.

I should be loth to part from Dr. Steinschneider without some expression of my admiration for the great achievement of scholarship by which he has crowned a life devoted to scholarly research, with a unity of aim which puts us all to shame. The mass of matter contained in these one thousand pages is something phenomenal. Thus in the four pages devoted to Berachyah, every single point in dispute is touched upon with a masterly control of all the relevant facts combined with an encyclopædic knowledge of all the relevant literature, good, bad, and indifferent. Nothing seems to have escaped Dr. Steinschneider, and, as a consequence, in that section of his book which deals with mediæval *belles lettres*, I have had a continual pleasure, analogous to that experienced by Joe Gargery, in Dickens's novel *Great Expectations*. Joe was not a great reader, but he liked reading because he now and then came across a J-O. Similarly I have had the pleasure (and sometimes the pain) of finding every suggestion I have ever made on the part taken by Jews in transmitting the wisdom of the East to the West immortalised in Dr. Steinschneider's pages. He even goes the length (p. 866) of referring to a book of mine which I am just now engaged upon: I hope to utilise Dr. Steinschneider's work for it, and expect to have my contribution dealt with by him in his next great work. For the most astonishing thing about the book is the youth of it; the keenness of its reflection, even the acrimony of its criticisms, has something of youthful energy about it. Dr. Steinschneider is, indeed, our Grand Old Man. More the shame that, after years spent in the almost mechanical toil of schoolmastering, he should have been allowed to pay the great cost of this monumental work out of his own means. One would have thought that Jewish Mæcenates would have competed for the honour of being concerned in a work that does honour both to Jews and Judaism. Alas, *that* is one of the few forms of competition in which Jews do not engage; still that is also one of the fine things about Dr. Steinschneider's career, that it has been free from the taint

of patronage. True scholarship comes in at the window when Mæcenas is turned away from the door. Meanwhile, we that are not Mæcenas can do our part by each buying a copy of this great work.

I turn now to Professor Bacher's too flattering review of my book on the *Jews of Angevin England*, which, by the courtesy of the editors, I have been allowed to see and answer (where answer is possible or needed) without having to wait the statutory three months. Professor Bacher is as ready to receive hypotheses favourably as Dr. Steinschneider is the opposite. I may have been somewhat lavish in my use of hypothesis, but that was the only way to get the various questions I have raised discussed by specialists in mediæval Hebrew literature, of whom Professor Bacher is one of the most distinguished. If it had been possible for me to test my suggestions about the English Tosaphists I would have done so, and suppressed those that might not be confirmed. But as that would have involved going through the whole of the Tosaphist literature, I shrank from the task, and have left the testing of my theories to the Tosaphist specialists. I depended for my information on their statements already published, and could not pretend to control them. This has in one or two cases led me into errors which Professor Bacher has pointed out, and I have thought it would be of use if I put on record here which of my identifications I consider have been shaken by Professor Bacher's thoroughgoing and minute criticism.

Professor Bacher looks with a favourable eye on my suggestion that Sir Leon, of Paris, was in London during the years 1182-98, when all Jews were exiled from the Isle de France; and he goes with me so far as to allow the possibility of Sir Leon's father-in-law, Abraham of Orleans, and *his* father, Joseph of Orleans, being also in England. But when I go further and identify Joseph of Orleans with the great exegete Joseph Bechor Shor, he opposes the authority of Zunz and others who distinguish between the two Rabbis. I fear Professor Bacher has shown himself not to be a Tosaphist specialist, as he is clearly unaware that Dr. Berliner has proved (*Mag.* 1, 93), and Dr. H. Gross, the greatest living authority on the subject, has accepted, that Joseph of Orleans is Joseph Bechor Shor by the ordinary process of showing that a saying attributed to the one in one place is affiliated to the other elsewhere. I thought the identification had become quite a commonplace among those interested in this subject. If, therefore, Professor Bacher is inclined to accept the equation Rabi Gotsche=Joseph of Orleans, the addition of Dr. Berliner's accepted equation Joseph of Orleans=Joseph Bechor Shor results by the simplest algebra in the conclusion Rabi Gotsche=Joseph Bechor Shor. I

would add that though Rabi Gotsche was in London in 1131, and his sons Isaac and Abraham were the heads of the London community throughout Henry II.'s reign, there is evidence that he afterwards migrated to Rouen, where his house was known as his as late as 1203, though it had passed through his son's and his grandson's hands (my book, p. 217). I have conjectured that it was his congenial society that kept Abraham ibn Ezra in North France for the last ten years of his life (1156-67).

Professor Bacher makes a decided point against me by showing that the interesting Responsum in the *Sepher Yashar*, the substance of which is given in my book, pp. 25, 26, is headed *שאלה מאורליינס* in the edition, and that appeal is made to Paris in the Responsum itself. I might escape the consequences by pointing out that the heading may be only an addition of the copyist, that it is unusual to find the name of a town as the source of a *שאלה*, that the heading could be emended into *שאלה [מיוסף] מאורליינס*, that even as late as 1242 London Jews appealed to Paris for the decision of a disputed point (*JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, V. 158 *seq.*), and that Orleans Jews would rather have thought of Rameru. But, on the whole, I am inclined to bow to Professor Bacher's correction, and shall probably withdraw the extract from any future edition of my book. I shall do so with great regret, owing to the remarkable light thrown by the Responsum on the Anti-Semitic spirit of the upper classes at the time, as likewise for its connection with the remarkable seal of Solomon ben Isaac, now at Edinburgh. I would point out to Professor Bacher that in the Responsum itself R. Solomon is distinctly stated to be a stranger, which is a further point of connection with the Spanish Rabbi.

I might have added, as a further argument against the location of the Responsum in Orleans, the very fact that the Rabbi concerned is known as R. Joseph of Orleans. Hitherto such names have been held to connect the Rabbi with the place, and it certainly proves his origin. But I contend that a Rabbi would not be known as of such and such a place till he had left it. Amongst the Jews of Orleans it would have been unnatural to refer to one of themselves as "of Orleans," whereas it would have been quite natural for those of London or Rouen to have used the local epithet, and similar cases occur in profusion in my name list (see Nos. 20-21, 91, 92, 94, 135, and *pass.*; see also names in italics, pp. 374-80). Hence I must still cling to my identification of Chaim de Paris and Moses de Paris. Professor Bacher's point that Chaim (= Vives) is a common name among English Jews is not quite a fair argument. If I find "Abraham Berliner" visiting Oxford, and venture on that account to identify him with a well-known scholar of that name, it is not in point to

argue that Abraham is a common name in England. The addition of the local epithet "de Paris" is to my mind decisive in both cases, and here I must remain of my own opinion still.

On the other hand, I think Professor Bacher has made good his objection to my identification of Sir Morel (R. Samuel ben Solomon, of Falaise) with the Morel who died in 1192 (*Pipe Rolls*, item No. 119, p. 145). If he were really the teacher of R. Meir, of Rothenburg (*ob.* 1293) he could not obviously have died a century before. The relationship is, however, not quite certain. Zunz, to whom the attribution is due, gives no authority for it (*Zur Gesch.*, 37), and when treating of R. Meir, p. 40, mentions Isaac ben Moses, of Vienna, as his teacher. Others, again, give Meir's teacher as Samuel b. Meshullam. Professor Bacher quotes Solomon Luria's authority as fixing Sir Morel in the thirteenth century, since he is mentioned as a contemporary of R. Jechiel, of Paris. But in the very same passage he is put side by side with R. Jacob (Tam) of Orleans, who died in London 1189, so that the whole question is still *sub lite*. I was misled by Zunz's statement that Sir Morel was the teacher of the martyr, R. Elia, of York (*l.c.*, p. 49), who must have died in 1190. Professor Bacher points out this is only a guess of Zunz, as the passage quoted only mentions R. Samuel, who, Professor Bacher suggests, was the Rashbam. He, however, died before 1160, and I would substitute the suggestion that the Yorkist's teacher was B. Samuel the Nakdan, of Bristol, and I still adhere to my suggestion that the Samuel quoted by R. Benjamin of Canterbury (or Cambridge) in his polemical notes to Joseph Kimchi, is the Nakdan of Bristol, and not the Rashbam, who did not meddle with grammar except casually in his exegetical writings (see *Rosin's* monograph, pp. 129 *seq.*) It is clear that the Berlin ר"י of R. Samuel will help to solve a number of problems, and I trust that the interest Professor Bacher has shown in the subject will lead him to examine, and, if possible, edit the work.

Professor Bacher has given conclusive grounds against the existence of a Tosaphist named R. Abraham ben Jehuda, and I withdraw my suggestion. So that as the nett result of Professor Bacher's thorough-going testing of my suggestions, I would withdraw an unimportant passage of eight lines on page 146, and put a warning to the reader in retaining the passage from the *Sepher Yosher*, pages 25, 26. On the other hand I shall be encouraged by Professor Bacher's adhesion to extend the passages I should quote in any future edition, from Joseph Bechor Shor, Sir Leon, and Elchanan.

Professor Bacher has been good enough to append to his own general remarks a list of minor errors he has observed in his very

thorough reading and testing of my book. It is a somewhat cruel kindness, which is liable to be misunderstood in England, where it is unusual to print in reviews a list of errors and misprints unless they happen to be serious ones. Many of Professor Bacher's suggestions indicate mere difference of opinion as to the method of translation. I was not writing a "crib" or literal translation, but one that would be read by a public entirely ignorant of Jewish matters. Again, several of Professor Bacher's corrections depend for their validity on emendations of the original texts, on which an amateur like myself durst not venture, even if I had been capable of making them. Thus the passage from Moses of Tachau is relieved of the mysterious "ox of the priest," *וּבֶפֶר כֹהֵן*, which puzzled me and all my learned friends by the simple emendation (*i.e.*, simple after it has been proposed) *וּבֶפֶר כֹהֵן*. In other cases Professor Bacher has a better text before him than I had access to at the time of writing. Finally, in several instances, I was simply following others, *e.g.*, Dr. Neubauer, on pp. 279, 280, and the late Professor Graetz, p. 263, and could plead the schoolboy's excuse, "Please, sir, it wasn't me." As to the misprints, which I regret to say I could largely supplement, cheap books have to be cheaply printed, and cheap printing means bad "reading" and many misprints. However, on the whole, I have escaped as well as I could have expected from the minute scrutiny of such an expert as Professor Bacher. It is not everybody who is, like him, a specialist in almost all branches of Jewish literature. As a "generalist," I do not grudge him the revenge he takes upon me for venturing in where specialists have hitherto feared to tread. The fact that he is inclined to accept nearly all the revolutionary hypotheses I have suggested consoles me somewhat for his rejection of some of my versions. And he does his correction so gently, that he makes it almost, though not quite, a pleasure to be corrected by him. Still, on the whole, I feel inclined to say with the lover to his mistress in the play :

No doubt it was right to dissemble your love,
But why did you kick me downstairs ?

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Jesus and Modern Life. By M. J. SAVAGE (Boston, U.S.A., 1893).

AS co-editor of THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW I received an American book called *Jesus and Modern Life*, by M. J. Savage. That such a book should have been sent to such a periodical is not,